Application No. 09/684,616 Amendment dated August 25, 2003 Reply to Advisory Action of July 23, 2003

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application with Claim 9 having been amended by the present amendment.

In the Office Action mailed April 25, 2003, Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Kanazawa et al.</u> in view of <u>Ryan et al.</u>; and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA).

Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action mailed April 25, 2003 indicates that if a scan electrode includes t strip portions, a sustain electrode must include two t strip portions. In the Request for Reconsideration filed June 25, 2003, Applicants presented comments that as explained at page 20, line 23 to page 21, line 6 in the specification, because pairs Xi1 and YLi1, and Xi2 and YRi2 are formed, there is no necessity for a sustained electrode to include two t strip portions if a scan electrode includes t strip portions as indicated by the outstanding Office Action. Applicants also pointed out that page 20, line 20 recites that "i2 does not equal i1." This case is discussed in the specification at page 20, line 23 to page 21, line 6. The Advisory Action has not offered any arguments concerning this feature which clearly illustrates that $i1 \neq i2$. Further, the recitation in the last four lines in Claim 1 which the Examiner referred to in the Advisory Action, corresponds to a case when the right and left

Application No. 09/684,616 Amendment dated August 25, 2003 Reply to Advisory Action of July 23, 2003

halfs of a row electrode Xi can be grasped as two strip portions and a common voltage is applied to both of the two strip portions (see the specification at page 2, lines 7-13).

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kanazawa et al. in view of Ryan et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Request for Reconsideration, Applicants provided arguments that there exists an addressing electrode 16 aside from a plurality of electrodes connected to the terminals +P1, +P2 and +P3 of a phased shift voltage generator 12. Although the Advisory Action recites "-P1, -P2, -P3" more correctly compared to the misdescription "P1, P2, P3" in the last Office Action, that does not change the situation. That is, Applicants consider a line with no reference number connected to the X axis starting cell 34 and the shift cell 35 in common to correspond to an addressing electrode. Accordingly, the Advisory Action has not explained how the shift electrode in Ryan et al. is able to function as an addressing electrode in a device which requires three different electrodes as in the present invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over AAPA. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite that the plasma display panel includes a plurality of barrier ribs separating the non-discharge cells from the discharge cells at least along a direction intersecting with the display line. These features are not shown in AAPA.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Application No. 09/684,616 Amendment dated August 25, 2003 Reply to Advisory Action of July 23, 2003

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 GJM/DAB/cja

I:\ATTY\DAB\198427US-AM.DOC

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599

David A. Bilodeau Registration No. 42,325